

counting procedures whereby dealers in personal property may exclude from gross income amounts withheld by banks and finance companies on notes purchased from such dealers employing the accrual method of accounting; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 8593. A bill to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, to provide that telephone and telegraph service furnished Members of the House of Representatives shall be computed on a unit basis; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H.R. 8594. A bill to provide for stabilization and orderly marketing in the poultry industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 8595. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to formulate and to put into operation a food stamp program, utilizing normal channels of trade; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 8596. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the application, payment, and refund of the tax on use of highway motor vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.R. 8597. A bill to provide for the development of a comprehensive family farm program, to bring the production of agricultural commodities into balance with demand therefor, to enable farmers to secure fair prices, to better utilize agricultural abundance in the Nation's interest at home and abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MEYER:

H.R. 8598. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act (as reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937) to require that prices stated in milk orders issued thereunder be expressed on a per quart basis; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 8599. A bill to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 8600. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to eliminate double liability in certain cases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 8601. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 8602. A bill to increase the maximum rate of mileage allowance for U.S. marshals traveling on official business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 8603. A bill to amend the act of October 30, 1951, by placing an annual limitation on publishers' second-class mail subsidies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 8604. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.J. Res. 490. Joint resolution relating to restoration of freedom to captive nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.J. Res. 491. Joint resolution relating to restoration of freedom to captive nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.J. Res. 492. Joint resolution for the establishment of a commission to study the nonmineral public land laws of the United States to facilitate the enactment of a more effective simplified and adequate system of laws governing the transfer of title to public lands to individuals, associations, corporations, and to State and local governments or their instrumentalities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.J. Res. 493. Joint resolution making a technical correction in section 5136 of the Revised Statutes (relating to national banks); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H. Res. 339. Resolution to discharge the Committee on the District of Columbia from further consideration of the bill H.R. 4630; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 340. Resolution providing two additional assistants for the document room, Office of the Doorkeeper; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Res. 341. Resolution authorizing the printing of the "U.S. Defense Policies in 1958" as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. LIBONATI presented a memorial of the State of Illinois relative to amendments to the law relating to GI insurance, making it possible for veterans to convert such GI insurance to other types of insurance, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 8605. A bill for the relief of Gustaf A. Lawson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 8606. A bill for the relief of Katherine O. Conover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 8607. A bill for the relief of Madge Wisdom Collier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 8608. A bill for the relief of Keiser Ruel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

250. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the mayor, Las Vegas, Nev., urging enactment of "home rule" legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

251. Also, petition of the city clerk, Reading, Pa., requesting enactment of Senate bill 1046 and House bill 4488, pertaining to labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

252. Also, petition of the executive vice president, Texas Manufacturers Association, Houston, Tex., commending the Congress for any action taken that has had for its purpose the balancing of the Federal budget through reduction in expenditures, and urging the Congress and the Texas delegation to support any effort designed to control inflation without impairing or restricting the free, unrestrained operation of our private competitive economy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Blackmail Picketing in a Velvet Glove

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are supposed to start debate on the so-called labor bill. I am sure every Member of this body is well aware of the deep issues involved. Every segment of our society has a vital interest in this proposed legislation because it affects all the elements of our complex economic life. It has much emotional appeal to the general public—because it affects every man who labors within or outside the unions.

Perhaps no one has a greater interest than the man who wants to labor and earn his wages free from the demands of coercive, racketeering, power hungry labor bosses—whose sole interest seems to be to get more money in the boss-controlled union treasury, so that he can get more power over his own members and the public at large by spending this money on controlling to a greater extent the political affairs of his community, State, and Nation.

Too many people are of the opinion that whenever a State adopts a so-called right-to-work law that this would solve all so-called labor problems. Such is not the case.

I trust that my colleagues will read the following letter written by a labor boss in Wichita, Kans. This is the new modern Teamsters approach for unionization of all employees. Read it care-

fully because this method and technique can be applied to any employer in America. The approach, as indicated in this letter, is clever and diabolical—another example of Hoffaism run wild. The letter shows the draftsmanship of a skiller operator who is sure of himself after being carefully advised by a sharp legal practitioner.

The form of this letter was initiated in Chicago and was used there on Chicago employers where it was highly successful.

Here is the letter as delivered to six trucking firms in Wichita, Kans. These firms are now being picketed as of this date—yet there is no strike, no contract negotiation, no nothing except blackmail of the rankest, foulest odor:

CHAUFFEURS, TEAMSTERS, AND HELPERS,
LOCAL UNION NO. 795,
Wichita, Kans., July 22, 1959.

DEAR SIR: Local 795, IBT, has decided to embark upon a campaign to organize your

office and clerical employees. To induce your employees to join this union, we shall begin to picket your establishment on or about the 27th of July 1959. We assure you that the picketing will be entirely peaceful. We have instructed our pickets not to threaten, intimidate, or coerce anyone. If there is any violation of those instructions, please advise us and we shall see to it that corrective action is taken immediately.

We wish to make it clear to you that local 795 does not at this time represent, and of course we do not claim to represent, a majority of your office and clerical employees. Local 795 does not ask you to recognize it as exclusive bargaining representative for your employees, or indeed, ask you to recognize it for any purpose at this time. The purpose of our picketing is solely to call to the attention of union members and supporters of organized labor that your office and clerical employees are not members of local 795.

We hope that the demonstration of support of local 795 in its efforts to organize, which this picketing will produce, will persuade your employees to become members of our local union. When they do, they will join the thousands of other employees who are affiliated with the great International Brotherhood of Teamsters. In engaging in this picketing campaign, we are speaking for the members of our organization who are employed in businesses like yours and who feel the brunt of the unfair competition of your unorganized employees.

This point we must emphasize. We are not making any demand upon your company at this time to agree to or execute any contract with our union covering any of your employees. Under the law your company is permitted to recognize and bargain with our local union only after a majority of your employees have authorized the union to represent them. Therefore, even if your company should now or hereafter offer to recognize our union or enter into collective bargaining with us our union would refuse such an offer and we would continue to refuse until your employees lawfully authorize us to represent them. Should your employees desire to join our union, they may apply for membership at the office of local 795, 417 East English, Wichita, Kans., or ask one of the pickets for a membership application card which they can fill out and return to him. When we have received applications from a majority of your employees, we will contact your company further.

You should also understand that it is your right under the Constitution of the United States and under the National Labor Relations Act to advise your employees of the economic detriment which you and they will sustain as a result of the withholding of patronage from your concern by union members and sympathizers as long as they remain nonmembers of our union.

You may, in the exercise of your lawful rights, explain these detriments to your employees and urge them to apply for membership in the union and thereby acquire for themselves and for your company the good will of our union and its friends. You may not, and we are sure that you will not, threaten to take economic reprisal against your employees, or grant them benefits, to coerce their choice in this matter. However, we feel sure that if your employees, who have been carefully taught to look to you for leadership on matters affecting their employment, are convinced that it is your sincere desire that they join the union, they will quickly realize that acquisition of union membership at the earliest opportunity is in their best interest.

Yours very truly,

S. E. SMITH,
President and Business Representative.

Mr. Speaker, now that you have read this blackmail letter—do you believe
CV—971

there are very many small businessmen in your district who can survive this sort of blackmail?

Briefly this is what the letter says:

"We know the law, and the law says we can picket you as an exercise of free speech so long as we do it peacefully.

"We know, also, that our picket at your door will put you out of business because you will not be able to move goods so long as our picket is there.

"We are under no necessity to sell the union to your employees because you will compel them to join our membership as quickly as the picketing shoe starts to pinch.

"There is no occasion for us to use force and violence and risk possible injunction proceedings against us because you, Mr. Employer, will do our job for us. You'll have to—or go out of business.

"We don't care about what your employees think or want. They will join our union or they won't work for you.

"We don't care, either, for the supposed constitutional or moral rights of your employees. They lost their rights when the lawmakers and the courts ceased to protect them and delivered their economic destiny into our hands."

This is the question every Member must answer: "Shall Congress submit to these blackmail evils?" Can a \$2-a-day man, carrying a placard, close up a business—under the guise of "It's legal because it is peaceful." We hear much about Iron Curtains—the Bamboo Curtain—the great free world society—but what about a curtain set up by a \$2-a-day picket?

UAR Interference With Suez Canal Free Passage Not To Be Tolerated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, once again, Israel has been forced to lodge a complaint with the Secretariat of the United Nations on Egypt's interference with freedom of passage through the Suez Canal.

This is not a matter which concerns Israel alone. We are faced with an infringement of maritime rights and a flouting of an international decision on the part of the United Arab Republic, which has gone a long way in establishing a dangerous precedent in the significant area of the freedom of the seas. Basic principles of maritime rights are being violated. It must be kept in mind that it is not only a matter of seizing Israeli ships but of seizing any ships which carry Israeli cargo, such as was done with the barring of the *Ingetoft* from transit through the canal because it carried Israeli cargo. This is only one incident in a long line of incidents.

Yet, the World Bank is seriously considering lending to the United Arab Republic a large sum of money for the enlargement of the Suez Canal. Thus, by

indirection, we are placing ourselves in a dangerous position of incurring the continued violation of maritime rights. The World Bank should make no such loan just so long as the Arab Republic is using the Suez Canal as a weapon against a free State in its effort to strangle the economy of Israel. At issue here is not the enlargement of the Suez Canal. The need to do so might very well exist. At issue, is whether international commitments of the right of passage can be arbitrarily violated, and whether such violation shall be encouraged by the granting of the pending loan. Neither the Constantinople Convention nor the United Nations Security Council decision are sufficient, it would appear, to prevent the United Arab Republic from using the Suez Canal for its own political purpose. That the United Arab Republic could impound unlawfully and with impunity, mail bags and scientific equipment taken off Norwegian ships bound for Israel, is hardly an act that can be passively viewed by any of the adherents to international law.

I emphasize again that any active encouragement, among which I would include the granting of a loan by the World Bank for the enlargement of the Suez Canal, aids and abets the establishment of a precedent, which will some day reach forward to shackle us.

Depressed Area Legislation Is Needed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, to thousands of American citizens, depressed area legislation is just as necessary today as it was a year ago. More so, in fact, for there has been an accumulation of misery in the intervening months. Another year has been added to the period in which so many willing hands have been idle due to reasons beyond their control. Industrial stagnation, which has prevailed particularly in communities where products of mines and plants have been deprived of markets by goods imported from across the seas, simply closes the door to job opportunities. It is destructive of ambition, incentive, and morale. It stunts individual, community, and national development.

But Congress cannot in conscience continue to ignore these conditions. Democratic representatives and Senators are among those of us who have introduced surplus labor legislation and have appealed for its enactment. I suggest that these voices be raised with renewed vigor, for time is running out on another session without accomplishment in this direction. Unless legislation is forthcoming, the leadership in this Congress must accept responsibility for an incongruity in which it rejects its own recommendation of the preceding session.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago Congress passed and sent to the White House the so-called depressed area bill. While that particular version of needed legislation was obviously too unsatisfactory to expect the President to attach his signature, there was nonetheless implicit in the measure an acknowledgment—by both the House and Senate—that legislation to assist surplus labor districts was necessary.

In the ensuing 12 months an encouraging number of unemployed men and women have returned to work, resulting in a highly favorable revision of surplus labor statistics by the Department of Labor. Unfortunately, however, the figures show no significant economic gain in numerous areas which have suffered most and over the longest periods of time. Included in those regions of prolonged and critical business activity are the neglected communities in Pennsylvania receiving no apparent benefits of the Federal Government's multibillion-dollar defense program.

In view of the continued distress in the most gravely-affected communities, Congress has been delinquent in failing to act on an admitted obligation. The new 86th Congress was organized in January, but there was no departure from the leadership that decided on the need for depressed area legislation in 1958. The same party is again in charge of both houses. I hope that the strategy employed last year—when a totally unacceptable bill was rushed through in the closing days of the session—is not responsible for the current delay. Political philandery is especially deplorable when hunger and want are involved.

Let us have action, Mr. Speaker.

A Bipartisan Commission To Study the Nonmineral Public Land Laws of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to establish a Bipartisan Commission To Study the Nonmineral Public Land Laws of the United States. The Commission will be charged with the responsibility of recommending to the next Congress a more effective, simplified, and adequate system of laws governing the transfer of title to public lands. I am convinced that the alternative to a new and modern system of land laws is chaos.

Every Member of Congress from our public land States knows that there is something drastically wrong with present methods of transferring title to our public lands to individuals, associations, corporations, and to States and local governments. With ever-increasing frequency we receive letters from our constituents complaining about the delay, redtape, and injustices they have experi-

enced after applying for a tract of the public domain under our existing laws. These complaints are duly relayed by us to the Bureau of Land Management, which administers the laws. I know of no more frustrating experience than that of being advised by the Bureau that the application from my constituent will be taken up in its turn, but because of the present workload action should not be expected for at least a year.

Modernization of our nonmineral public land laws is long overdue. As this Nation expanded it was to the interest of our Government to get the public domain into private hands as rapidly as possible. The Nation needed revenue, our land needed developing, and the country needed the crops such development produced.

Laws to facilitate the transfer of the public domain into private ownership were enacted to meet the needs of the times. Altogether, some 5,000 private and public laws have been passed by Congress for this purpose. Many of those laws are still on the books and as a result our Government and its citizens are confronted with a patchwork of conflicts and contradictions.

The multiplicity of these laws governing disposal of the public domain has created intolerable administrative difficulties.

For example, a single tract of unserved, vacant public domain can be covered simultaneously by applications under the Desert Entry, Small Tract, Homestead, Private Exchange, Soldier's Script Rights, Public Sale, Recreation, and Public Purposes, or State School Selection Acts. The cost to the Government of resolving these conflicts, of deciding under which act the tract should be disposed of and to whom, vastly exceeds the value of the land itself.

Compounding the confusion created by this hodgepodge of law is the ever-increasing pressure from our citizens, local governments, and industry for acquisition or use of the public domain. Under present laws, each application must be considered separately. The land involved must be examined and classified. Protests must be heard. Appeals must be decided. Conflicts must be resolved. In 1954, the Bureau started the year with a backlog of 25,013 cases to be adjudicated. By 1958, despite generous increases in appropriations to expedite these cases, the backlog had increased to 54,725.

A large number of these cases are traceable to the operations of land locators. Taking advantage of the present complexities of our public land laws, they have led thousands of our citizens to believe that the public domain is theirs for the asking. Their clients are not told that before they can obtain title under the Desert Land Act, the land must be irrigated and put into agricultural production. Assuming that water is available—which in most cases is not—this requires an outlay of over \$25,000. Yet these land locators continue to bilk the general public out of millions of dollars per year by filing applications which they know are doomed to rejection. The administrative burden this imposes upon the Government

is tying up effective management or transfer of the public domain.

The study commission proposed in my bill would limit its consideration to non-mineral public land laws. I do not mean to imply that there are not conflicts in other public land use statutes. It is, however, in the field of public land disposition where administrative burdens imposed by conflicting laws are penalizing the individual seeking land, the Government, and the taxpayer.

The commission would be bipartisan, three members to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, three by the President of the Senate, and three by the President. A thoroughgoing study of our nonmineral land laws has been needed for years. The redrafting of these laws to meet present-day needs of our people is a must. Until this is done, effective and efficient administration of the public domain is impossible.

Restoration of Freedom to Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution which I hope will receive the approval of Congress before we adjourn this session.

This resolution calls for an affirmation by Congress that it is the intent of the Congress of the United States that the people of the captive nations of Europe be given a right to choose their own philosophy of government and their own rulers in a spirit of complete freedom.

I am enclosing an editorial which appeared in the Washington Star, commenting on the unprecedented reception given our Vice President by the people of Poland during his recent visit to that country.

The estimated 250,000 Poles who greeted the Vice President of the United States upon his arrival in Warsaw should demonstrate to the entire free world the very profound yearning and respect that these Polish people have for the United States and for the principles of freedom. This was not necessarily an expression for Mr. Nixon but, rather, it was the only way the Poles could demonstrate their admiration for America and their traditional hatred of communism.

As the Washington Star points out in its editorial of August 4—

Directly and indirectly, the people of Poland have said many eloquent things in the extraordinarily warm welcome they have accorded Vice President Nixon. In marked contrast to their lukewarm, if not sullen, reaction to Soviet Premier Khrushchev's recent visit, they have left no room for doubt that their heart belongs much more to the United States than to the U.S.S.R.

I firmly believe that the United States should now go on record, as categorically as we can, that we in this country and

the people of the free world in general share with the people of the captive nations their longing for freedom.

The adoption of the resolution which I have proposed today would indeed be a heartening reassurance to these people that their great dedication to the principles of freedom, which they continue to maintain despite the fact that they have had to live under Communist rule forced upon them after World War II, is greatly respected by those of us fortunate enough to live in a free country.

I am one of those who views with great concern the pending visit of Soviet Premier Khrushchev to this country. I do not think that it will serve the purposes announced by those who have arranged this visit. However, since the Soviet Premier is going to be in this country, I think that it is incumbent on the Members of Congress to make known to the President of the United States that when the Soviet Premier does come here, the President should firmly impress on him that this Nation must continue to view all Soviet foreign relations with suspicion so long as these captive nations are forcefully held in the Soviet orbit.

It should be made clear to Mr. Khrushchev that there is a true road to peace, and that road leads through the captive nations, which must be given an opportunity to choose their own government in free and unfettered elections supervised by the United Nations before tensions in Europe can be eased.

It should be made clear to Mr. Khrushchev that you cannot take the noble nations of central Europe and plunge them under Communist rule against their will and expect lasting peace in Europe.

If the Soviet Premier sincerely wants peace, let him demonstrate it to the free world by releasing the captive nations from their forceful rule by Moscow and let these nations voluntarily pick their own form of government.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star editorial, which I mentioned earlier, follows. I believe that it eloquently speaks out for the cause of a free Poland and all the other nations now being held captive by the Communists:

[From the Washington Star, Aug. 4, 1959]

CATALYST IN POLAND

Directly and indirectly, the people of Poland have said many eloquent things in the extraordinarily warm welcome they have accorded Vice President Nixon. In marked contrast to their lukewarm, if not sullen, reaction to Soviet Premier Khrushchev's recent visit, they have left no room for doubt that their heart belongs much more to the United States than to the U.S.S.R.

This is a fact that may be stated quite objectively, without any desire to draw invidious comparisons. The Poles and the Russians, after all, have been at odds for centuries, often in the most bitter way—under the Czars as well as under the Communists. Mr. Khrushchev himself, who presumably okayed the Warsaw regime's decision to invite Mr. Nixon, is too good a student of history to have to be told about this, and we may assume that he has not been particularly surprised by what has happened—hurt perhaps, but not surprised.

The truth is, of course, that there is a unique affinity—historical and affectionate—between our country and the Poles. Since that long-ago time when men like Pulaski

helped George Washington to achieve victory over the British in the American Revolution, great numbers of these people, over a period of generations, have emigrated to the United States and played an important part in building it to its present greatness. Small wonder, therefore, that Mr. Nixon has gone through a sort of triumphal march in Warsaw.

But the plaudits of the great Polish crowds have been addressed not simply to the Vice President, but to our entire country and to the free way of life it stands for. Mr. Nixon in that sense, by his presence over there, has been a kind of catalyst. Just the sight of him has been enough to move the people—hundreds of thousands of them—to cry "Bravo, America!" and to make clear that years of Communist control (somewhat less stringent than in most satellite lands) have not succeeded in eradicating their love of liberty and their pro-American views.

Knowing the Poles as they do, Mr. Khrushchev and his colleagues in the Kremlin probably have not been taken aback by all this. Yet, since the same sort of mood prevails in varying degrees throughout their satellite empire, they must sometimes wonder most seriously about the loyalty of that empire and their ability to hold on to it. This is one of the subjects that Mr. K. is likely to be challenged on repeatedly, and at great length, when he visits our country next month.

Khrushchev Would Feel at Home at TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include excerpts from a newsletter of August 9 by Mr. Thurman Sensing, executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council, of Nashville, Tenn., as follows:

As more or less of a postscript, we notice a Senator has written the President a letter urging him by all means to have Mr. Khrushchev include a survey of the TVA in his tour of the United States. Well, if the thought is to make him feel at home, we should say that is a pretty good idea—because he will certainly find no free enterprise there. But what is Mr. Khrushchev himself to think, when we parade the TVA before him with pride, than that we are already aping his philosophy of state ownership and state control—and that we are already on our way toward making his prophecy about our grandchildren come true? We all want peace, yes, but must we obtain it at the expense of consorting with Communists and by the loss of our self-respect?

Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy, but not surprising, since the organization which Mr. Sensing represents is located in the heart of the Tennessee Valley Authority, that he would dare make such a statement; but the facts are, Mr. Sensing, like most every patriotic, deep-thinking American who lives close to the scene, knows full well that the final effect of that socialistic, autocratic empire within our free Republic will bring nothing but dictatorship and misery to

the good people of that vast area who are at this very minute dominated by a board of three men not elected by the people.

One of the most important duties of Congress, now and in the near future, is to keep the Socialists from organizing the other great river valleys in the United States of America and prevent the same fate as has befallen the people in the Tennessee River Valley—for if that should be accomplished then 27 men not elected by the people would be in complete control of the lives and property of every American.

I hope every reader of this statement will write me requesting a copy of my speech of May 4 on this all-important subject.

H.R. 8575

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to express in greater detail my concern over one aspect of H.R. 8575 which was passed this afternoon. The Appropriations Committee's action in denying funds in this bill for new barracks at the naval submarine base in Groton, Conn., came as a shock and a surprise to all of us who have followed this situation closely.

Probably no single weapon in America's arsenal of defense is more promising and more vital to our position in the free world than the Polaris missile and the nuclear submarines which will carry it. This Congress has consistently recognized the value of the Polaris weapons system. Time and again we have cut through confusing and conflicting inter-service rivalries to grant the highest priority to the Polaris concept. The Congress has shown the way to a reluctant Executive by increasing administration recommendations for Polaris authorizations and appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, the item deleted by the Appropriations Committee is the very heart of this program. It would have provided for the men who will give life to the Polaris program. Specifically, it would have provided housing for the hundreds of skilled submariners who will constitute the two crews of each Polaris submarine.

To eliminate this item, previously requested by the Navy and authorized by the Congress, simply does not make sense.

The Polaris program, as advanced as it is, cannot be put into operation without men. These men will be trained at the submarine school of the naval submarine base in Groton, the most advanced school of its type in the world. In May of this year the Navy announced that it considered the training of Polaris crews of sufficient importance to assign two crews to each Polaris submarine instead of the usual one. One crew will be

in training ashore at Groton while the other crew is at sea. This precedent-shattering move indicates the importance the Navy attaches to the Polaris program. Yet the committee action in deleting funds for housing for these men will seriously hamper the entire training program.

Mr. Speaker, when the authorization bill for this construction was before the Armed Services Committee earlier this year, there was no question as to the importance of this item. When the House passed the authorization bill there was no question as to its importance. Now, apparently, because of a feeling that the Navy might be able to use Government-owned land in the Groton area for this construction rather than acquire additional land, the entire item has been deleted. If the Appropriation Committee's action is ultimately sustained, we shall have seriously stalled one of the most important phases of our national defense.

It has been suggested, Mr. Speaker, that sectional rivalries for the site of the Polaris training school entered into the decision of the committee. I am sure this is untrue.

As every Navy man knows, Groton, Conn. is the submarine capital of the world. Officers and men from every one of our allies which maintains a submarine force have been trained there. It represents a concentration of facilities and know-how unduplicated anywhere on the globe.

The Navy, itself, has long since acknowledged the preeminence of the Groton base.

I am sure that the committee's action was well intended and in keeping with its traditional diligence in assuring American taxpayers with the maximum return on their tax dollar. Nevertheless, I am also sure that this action could only have resulted from a failure to realize the consequences to the vital Polaris program. I think it is essential that the full amount of \$2,269,000 be restored before H.R. 8575 reaches the President for approval. If not, we will have unwittingly struck a seriously damaging blow to our national defense.

Publishers' Second-Class Mail Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I feel impelled to rise in reply to the recent remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] entered in the RECORD on July 28, 1959, in support of H.R. 8433, introduced by him on that date to place an annual limitation on what he calls publishers' second-class mail subsidies.

The gentleman takes the flat position that the present second-class rate struc-

ture affords an unjustified subsidy to newspaper and magazine publishers.

I think it is only fair to call to the attention of the House, at the outset, the fact that the cost statistics which ornament the gentleman's remarks are supplied by the Post Office Department, itself.

The publishers have time and again demonstrated the illusory character of the Department's cost-accounting system. But it is not necessary to rely on the publishers alone for this demonstration.

A study of the record will show that this House has long ago learned that it must guard itself against so-called Post Office statistics.

As recently as 1954, the Post Office Department conducted a survey based on over 2,000 interviews, the questions asked being, in the opinion of Congressman DAWSON, of Illinois, chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, so framed as to bring out what the Department wanted to prove.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, that committee found, as stated in its 1956 report—House Report No. 2914, 84th Congress, 2d session, page 9—that “the timing of the survey to coincide with congressional consideration of legislation proposed by the Post Office Department to increase postage rates,” and the circumstances surrounding its confederation, “strongly support the conclusion that the survey was made and distributed” in direct violation of title 18, United States Code, section 1913.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not aware of the total unreliability of data supplied to the Congress by the Post Office Department, for he asserted categorically, in his remarks in support of his bill, that what he calls subsidies to the publishers—and I quote his own words—“are carefully hidden in the overall bookkeeping operations of the Post Office Department”—page 14544.

For my own part, Mr. Speaker, I am entirely satisfied that it is really the excess revenues received by the Post Office Department over the cost of handling second-class mail matter, which, in the words of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, “are carefully hidden in the overall bookkeeping operations of the Post Office Department.”

The system of accounting employed by the Post Office Department simply does not give appropriate consideration to the relatively low cost of handling second-class mail, which a proper accounting system would show.

For instance, the Post Office accounting system fails to take into account, the fact that, to save time, many publishers themselves transport a large part of their newspapers from the place of publication thereof, to delivering post offices; so that the Post Office Department, while collecting second-class mail rates for the entire transportation service, performs no part of it whatever except minimal ultimate terminal delivery.

It must be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that the present system of high zone rates on second-class mail matter, had

its genesis in 1917, as a measure to raise revenue for the First World War.

That bill was not referred to the Post Office Committee of this House for consideration. It went to the Committee on Ways and Means, as a revenue measure.

As stated by one of my distinguished predecessors from Louisiana in this House, the Honorable J. Zach Spearing, of New Orleans, the 1917 postal revenue statute “was a war measure to seek additional income from any and every source possible, including the Post Office Department”; and he said that the publishers were to be commended for their patriotic attitude, because they “did not, at the time of the increases, make any complaint”—volume 69, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5783.

But, Mr. Speaker, even at the time that the first of these measures to raise revenue through increases in second-class mail rates was being considered in this House, the principle of keeping those rates low to conform to our concept of a free press was being emphasized.

At that time, for instance, Congressman Mondell, of Wyoming, called the attention of the House to the fact that—

We have here established a rule common to all English-speaking people the world over, common to democracies the world over of treating the dissemination of news, of ideas, of literature differently from the manner in which we treat the transportation of cotton and bacon and ham. (55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2769.)

At the same time, Congressman Mann, of Illinois, pointed out (55 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2765-2766):

We spend every year in the United States hundreds of millions of dollars in primary education and a very large amount in college education for the youths. But the great educational force of the country is in the newspapers and magazines. * * * Now, no one would suggest that we close our schools by taxation for this purpose and spend it on the war. * * * The circulation of the newspapers and magazines throughout the country, with their advertisements, has contributed more to the growth of business in this country, unparalleled in the world, than any other single factor. * * * We can raise sufficient money in other ways, without endeavoring to lay the heavy hand of taxation upon those influences which have worked from the start for the best interests of the country.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no question that proper accounting will show that present second-class mail rates, with their special zone rates on advertising, are substantially in excess of the cost of handling mail matter of the second class in the post offices of the country.

Advertising, Mr. Speaker, is the great force primarily responsible for the freedom and independence of our press from undesirable influences.

As conceded by the gentleman from Pennsylvania in his address to this House just a few days ago—page 14545—“actually, the subscribers to these magazines would eventually pay for the increased postage costs.”

Mr. Speaker, it is the subscribers to the newspapers and magazines who are paying the tax presently levied in the form of excess second-class postal rates

on the advertising content of publications passing through the mails.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this tax on advertising is an infringement of the freedom of the press guaranteed by our Constitution to those subscribers.

And I submit further, Mr. Speaker, that any contemplated increase in overall second-class postage rates, even in the guise of a limitation on so-called publishers' second-class mail subsidies, would be an aggravated infringement of the same fundamental constitutional guarantee.

The Control of Inflation by Making Price Stability an Explicit Goal of National Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my studies on the causes of inflation and its impact upon the various segments of our economy, have led me to suggest several areas where the Government could take specific steps to curb the disastrous effects of inflation.

One of the most elemental of these is the statement of policy which the Federal Government should make to insure that reasonable price stability is an explicit goal of our economic policy.

To do this, I have today introduced a bill which would amend the Employment Act of 1946 so that price stability can be included as an integral part of the economic policy of the country.

In addition to promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power under the act, my bill would add the simple but all-important statement, "at reasonably stable prices." This would become the new declaration of policy under the Employment Act of 1946.

In that section of the Employment Act dealing with the Economic Report of the President, my bill would call for the report to set forth also "current and foreseeable trends in price levels prevailing in the economy, and other steps, if any, which have been taken to counter inflationary and deflationary pressures arising within the economy."

The legislation which I am introducing would also call upon the Council of Economic Advisers to include among its duties the recommendation of policies on purchasing power and maintenance of a reasonably stable level of prices.

The President has recommended in his state of the Union message this year that the Employment Act of 1946 be amended to include reasonable price stability as an explicit goal of the Federal economic policy.

The interim report of the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability and Economic Growth recommended that Congress give highest priority to the proposal outlined by the President.

My friends, this is one of the elementary things which Congress can do: speak out clearly on price stability and thus assure the people that it is our goal to fight inflation at this level by every means.

I do not recommend forced price controls. In many respects, they would be worse than our present situation. Price controls always lead to wage controls and the freedom of the individual and our economy both suffer. Such controls have been in force in war time, but certainly they should not be justified in time of peace. Peace stability can be implemented with the same force and direction that we give to maintaining as full employment as possible; or full production; or full purchasing power. The policy needs the direction which a specific national goal, backed by the administration and the Congress, can give it.

There comes a time in the implementation of our economic policy when we should give the consumer a break. I agree with my colleague, Congressman WALTER JUDD who helped draft the original Employment Act of 1946, and who also sees the wisdom of amending that act now so that price stability is covered.

Congressman JUDD feels that when the combined forces of industry and labor increase productivity, which usually results in an increase in wages and profits, there should also be some thought given to price reductions. I concur that one of the rounds in the wage-price spiral should veer off to benefit the consumer. Whenever possible, give him a reduced price to lower the cost of living and help improve his purchasing power. You can see how much we would broaden the base of purchasing power if we were to think in terms of reduced prices for the consumer once in a while.

At the present time one of America's largest industries is in the throes of a costly strike. Wages in the steel industry are high. Profits have been high also. There is no doubt in my mind that steel prices can be reduced and the normal workload carried on with a reasonable cost-of-living increase in wages, or comparable fringe benefits, and still give a tremendous boost to the average consumer who is seeing his purchasing power dwindle more each time there is a strike which increases wages and inevitably increases prices. What a great thing it would be to give the consumer a seat at the bargaining table and to consider his stake. We would really be combating inflation then.

I am also disturbed by the announcement that one of the major oil companies might increase the price of gasoline; only a cent a gallon to be sure, but, nevertheless, another increase. Nothing I have read or heard to date convinces me that there is any solid justification for an increase. We all know that it would spread to the other companies and the consumer would be nicked again.

This is the time to hold the line; to use every voluntary means of holding down prices. When we do this we halt the spiral; we improve the purchasing power of the average individual and we

make a solid blow against the cruelest tax of all—inflation.

Congress has the power to act in seeing that price stability is forthrightly enunciated as one of the goals of our economic policy. This would be the opportune time to make the simple, but important, changes which we need to put the Federal Government on the side of those taking earnest steps to control inflation. Whether it is my bill, or one of similar intent, is not important. The important thing is to write this language on price stability into law so that our future programs will be governed by it.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following is my newsletter to constituents dated August 8, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

AUGUST 8, 1959.—The floor fight of the year in the House of Representatives is approaching; the subject—the controversial labor bill. Historically, the evolution of collective bargaining from countless local employer-employee agreements to nationwide and industrywide negotiations, from private settlement of differences of wages and working conditions to the mandate of Federal labor law, from a union resolution mailed to a legislator to all-out campaigning for and against lawmakers—all this and more will be a part of the debate. Unions have grown due to a recognition, by all, of workers' legitimate needs; but with that growth has come power and the not infrequent abuse of power. Growth often ended in monopoly, above and beyond reach of the Nation's laws—ended in cruel and greedy control of working people by dictatorial bosses. These facts and trends have been pointed up over and over again, beyond all dispute, by the McClellan committee hearings.

So what did Congress do? Last year, a weak and therefore worthless Kennedy-Ives bill was passed by the Senate and killed by the House. Later, politicians used their support or rejection of this bill to explain their position on labor legislation. The public, more curious than aroused, listened and voted. Even more labor-supported candidates were elected to Congress. Now an indignant citizenry expects labor legislation to be passed which will correct the outrageous abuses pointed up by the McClellan committee. A somewhat stronger labor bill was passed by the Senate this year. The House Labor Committee, however, reported a watered-down version, which I will call the committee bill. Unsatisfied with this, some members of the committee set to work drafting a bipartisan substitute bill (Landrum-Griffin) with "teeth" in it. This bill meets several of President Eisenhower's earlier requests of Congress for corrective labor legislation. Now the question is, can enough votes be mustered in support of this substitute bill from the Republicans (total 153) and the Democrats (256) to make a majority of 219?

The differences between the committee and substitute bills can best be summarized in these five basic areas, none of which was adequately covered by the committee bill: (1) Rights of union members: The substitute bill restores the bill of rights to union members (free speech, secret vote, fair dues, etc.); (2) union finances: The substitute bill requires all unions to make financial reports (committee bill would exempt 70 percent of unions from this reporting), the lack of which has cost union members approximately \$10 million already in graft and corruption; (3) no man's land: Under present law many small unions and little businessmen with small troubles are denied access to the National Labor Relations Board and yet are prevented from seeking recourse to State courts or agencies. In this no man's land they can find no protection from racketeering elements; (4) blackmail picketing: The present unscrupulous use of picketing to (a) force recognition of a union which the employees themselves have rejected; or (b) force an employer to recognize one union while the law requires him to recognize another, would be barred by the substitute bill. Legitimate picketing would not be affected; (5) secondary boycotts (including hot cargo): Coercion by unions of other employees or firms, who are in no way involved in a labor dispute, in order to align them against a business with whom the union has a disagreement would be prevented by the substitute bill. Violence and racketeering are particularly prevalent in this field, but the committee bill is all but silent on the subject.

The substitute bill is not punitive nor in any way harmful to legitimate union leaders and members, but rather protective of both. In fact, this is a minimum bill. Anything less, such as the committee or Senate bills, would be worthless. The great danger is a whitewash of the abuses of monopolistic and dictatorial power. My own belief is that a measure such as H.R. 8003, which I introduced, placing unions under the same anti-trust sanctions applicable to everybody else, is necessary. (1) Restrictive trade practices, and (2) restraints of trade, forbidden by H.R. 8003, are areas only partially covered even by the substitute bill. Public pressure based on accurate understanding of the facts—facts that include: (a) The McClellan committee findings, and (b) the meanings of the various labor bills, and (c) the lobbying pressures on Congressmen—is necessary. As usual, the legislation that's passed will result from what the people want. It's up to John and Jane Doe now.

The adjournment date of Congress is still more uncertain, although it may be affected by Khrushchev's impending visit. Some Members of Congress, including me, do not welcome the thought of a speech to a joint session of Congress by the Communist boss.

Controversial pending legislation hangs in the balance. Some may be postponed to next year's session for action.

Some Observations on the Exchange of Visits With Khrushchev and Its Expected Impact on Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I know that many Members have given a good deal of thought to the exchange of visits between President Eisenhower and Soviet

Premier Khrushchev, which will take place later this fall, and the implication which these visits may have on our foreign policy. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD my current newsletter to the people of the 32d Congressional District of New York, in which I outline my views on this important subject in some detail.

The newsletter follows:

While the House of Representatives waited last week for the all-important debate on labor legislation which is scheduled to begin on Tuesday, the second most important topic of conversation here has been the impending September visit of Prime Minister Khrushchev to the United States, and President Eisenhower's visits to the NATO countries later this month and to the Soviet Union in the fall.

In general, comment here in Congress on President Eisenhower's decision has been favorable although it has also been cautious. We recognize, of course, that the Geneva talks have ended in failure, with the Russians refusing to back down from their earlier demands that we get out of Berlin. We recognize too that this is the kind of visit which Mr. Khrushchev has always wanted to make, and which, until now, President Eisenhower has steadfastly opposed in the absence of any area of agreement at the lower foreign ministers level. To this extent Khrushchev seems to have won.

On the other hand, there has now been an exchange of visits by the Soviet Deputy Premiers Mikoyan and Kozlov in one direction and Vice President Nixon in the other. Most people on Capitol Hill, regardless of party, would agree, I think, that Mr. Nixon's visit to Russia and Poland has been an outstanding success. He conducted himself with great dignity and ability, and by defending American principles in open face to face no-holds-barred debate with Khrushchev he has succeeded in breaking through some of the formal diplomatic barriers that have surrounded so much of our dealings with the Russians.

Vice President Nixon is convinced himself that the invitation to Khrushchev has been a wise move. I'm inclined to agree simply because this visit will make it possible for Mr. Khrushchev, who has never been to this country before, to see for himself that the American people are solidly behind our Government in opposing communism and all communism stands for and that we have the determination and will to fight for what we believe in if need be.

One of the real dangers in the cold war, as most experts have recognized, is that the Soviets might make the same kind of fatal miscalculation about us and our intentions as the Japanese did when they struck at Pearl Harbor. A trip to the United States by Mr. Khrushchev ought to convince him we are not softies, as the Japanese leaders so foolishly thought. If we can convince him of this we may prevent any similar miscalculation by the Russians, with regard to Berlin or Formosa, or any other critical trouble spot.

If the Khrushchev visit does nothing more than this, it will certainly have contributed to our national security.

On the other hand, most people down here also recognize very realistically that the Khrushchev visit is not likely to alter the general situation in the cold war. Mr. Khrushchev is still the same brutal dictator he has always been. Showing him politely around Washington, New York, or other parts of our country does not by any means indicate that we subscribe to his actions in making prisoners of the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain in countries like Poland, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. Or just because Mr. Khrushchev may

make a few bad jokes at a party in this country doesn't mean that we would be wise in backing down on our policy of firmness in Berlin. Even the face-to-face discussions between the Soviet dictator and President Eisenhower are not going to change the basic objectives and designs of Soviet policy, which are to spread communism over the world and bury capitalism, as Khrushchev has so often threatened to do. This is still their basic intention.

Nevertheless, these forthcoming trips by President Eisenhower are significant because they mean that the President is playing an increasingly more direct and personal role in the conduct of our foreign policy. Because of his wartime experience, and his admitted ability at dealing with people personally, I can't help but feel that these visits may help at least to clear the air, and give us the chance to look at the exact area of our differences from a slightly new angle. This in itself will be worth while, because, with the tremendous destructiveness of modern nuclear weapons, all of us must do our best to try to find a formula for peace.

I'm particularly pleased that President Eisenhower will be going abroad first to visit our NATO allies. This trip will underscore, before the Eisenhower-Khrushchev talks begin, our determination to keep our NATO alliance together, which seems to be the one thing which Mr. Khrushchev objects to most strenuously. I have just one suggestion for the President, and that is that he include in his visit a personal appearance in West Berlin. Berlin and the whole German question are still a major point of difference between us and the Communists, as Khrushchev has just recently made clear again. By making a personal visit to West Berlin, Mr. Eisenhower will underline in the clearest possible terms that Khrushchev's visit to Washington in no way reflects any change in our determination to stand behind the people of Berlin against the threat of Communist aggression. I hope Mr. Eisenhower will add this extra stop to his itinerary, because I am sure it will relieve the minds of many people who otherwise are seriously troubled over the Khrushchev visit.

Notice of Hearings on Proposed Legislation Which Would Provide an Exemption From the Antitrust Laws To Authorize Cooperative Associations of Milk Producers To Bargain With Purchasers Singly or in Groups, and for Other Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and as chairman of its Antitrust Subcommittee, I wish to announce the commencement of hearings on S. 753 and H.R. 7191, to authorize cooperative associations of milk producers to bargain with purchasers singly or in groups, and for other purposes.

It is the Antitrust Subcommittee's intention to hold hearings on these bills August 20 and August 21, 1959. All persons who wish to appear and testify at hearings on these bills are requested to

notify Mr. Herbert N. Maletz, chief counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee, room 230, Old House Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 4853, as soon as possible.

**Unrestricted World Travel by the People,
as Well as Heads of Government, Can
Only Bring About Better Understanding
Between People Everywhere**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, unrestricted world travel by the people, as well as heads of Government, can only bring about a better understanding between people everywhere in a world which has grown really quite small.

It is the people, and especially the young people, who can learn and who can profit from travel and from living for awhile, be it ever so brief, among other peoples and in other nations, for they will be tomorrow's leaders.

There can be no strangers in this world since there are no longer faraway places in these days of the jet transport.

The free world must welcome the opportunity which the Vice President has opened up for further development of exchanges of people and of cultural programs.

In his Moscow television speech, Vice President Nixon declared:

Both the exchange of persons and the cultural exchange programs should not only be continued but sharply expanded. The more Americans who visit and get to know firsthand the people of the Soviet Union and the more Soviets who do the same in the United States, the better understanding we shall have.

Both World War I and World War II grew out of basic miscalculations on the part of the leaders of Germany as to what the reaction of America and the free world would be. We cannot disarm, nor can we hope for peace until the leaders of the Soviet Union know America well enough to avoid similar miscalculations about our people and our iron purpose to maintain the freedoms which we consider essential.

The Eisenhower-Nixon policy of barnstorming exchanges between top Government leaders can be looked upon by the American people with approval if later developments do not indicate that it comes about only as a result of the failure of the Geneva Conference.

The gladhanding of top officials, however, can be misleading. We in the United States must remain firm as we calmly evaluate the newspaper headlines reporting the outward actions and words of the candidates for national and world acclaim.

It is unfortunate that we cannot know what goes on behind the closed doors of secret diplomacy. There must be no

more Pearl Harbors for the American people to regret.

It is interesting to note that a spontaneous movement to promote closer relations between teachers of the East and West has developed in Washington, D.C., at an assembly of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession.

The New York Times of August 6, 1959, reports that the move came when delegates from several European nations offered to set up programs to exchange information with Asian representatives.

Dr. William G. Carr, secretary-general of the confederation, hailed the plan for exchanges. Dr. Carr, who is also executive secretary of the National Education Association, said that foundation support would be sought to make the exchanges possible. The organizations represented at the meeting in the Nation's Capital represents some 3 million teachers throughout the world.

I have recently introduced a bill, H.R. 7533, to amend the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 to authorize the President to provide for participation by foreign governments and citizens of other countries in artistic and cultural activities in the United States.

This bill amends Public Law 860, 84th Congress. This legislation, first, would make the President's special international cultural exchange program a true two-way exchange program which it is not at present; second, provide for the inclusion of students of and teachers in educational institutions in the United States and abroad. The major if not whole emphasis of this program at present is on the professional. Van Cliburn was a product of the Juilliard School of Music; Jaime Laredo, who won first prize recently in the Queen Elisabeth of Belgium International Music Competition, was a graduate of the Curtis Institute, yet these and other great American artists have not been included in the President's special international program.

Another provision of this bill, H.R. 7533, would enlarge the present Advisory Committee on the Arts in the Department of State from 9 to 21 members. The 12 members of the Advisory Committee on the Arts first appointed under the provisions of H.R. 7533 must be appointed by the Secretary of State from among persons nominated by the following organizations: the Music Educators National Conference, the American Educational Theater Association, the College Art Association of America, the National Art Education Association, the National Council of the Arts in Education, the American National Theater and Academy, the National Music Council, the American Federation of Arts, the American Institute of Architects, the National Education Association, the American Council on Education, the American Council of Learned Societies, the Association of American Colleges.

This bill, H.R. 7533, also provides that the Commissioner of the U.S. Office of Education shall be Vice Chairman ex officio of the Advisory Committee on the Arts of the Department of State.

If this administration is really serious about expansion of the exchange of per-

sons and the cultural exchange programs it will strongly support my bill, H.R. 7533, and similar legislation which is before the Congress at this time which has been introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, coauthors of the Humphrey-Thompson Act, Public Law 860, 84th Congress.

I include the text of my bill, H.R. 7533, a New York Times article, and an article by Doris Fleeson which appeared in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star of August 4, 1959:

H.R. 7533

A bill to amend the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 to authorize the President to provide for participation by foreign governments and citizens of other countries in artistic and cultural activities in the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 3 of the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 1992) is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 3." and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) The President is authorized to provide for participation by foreign governments and by citizens of other countries in activities in the United States similar to those provided for in subsection (a) of this section and section 12 of this Act, except that he shall not provide for the participation of industrial or trade exhibitors or exhibits in trade and industrial fairs in the United States under this subsection.

"(c) (1) Students of and teachers in, educational institutions in the United States who are sent abroad, either individually or in groups, under the provisions of this Act shall be selected through the Institute of International Education or a comparable organization which shall also arrange for their tours abroad and for their participation and presentations in festivals, competitions, and exhibitions abroad.

"(c) (2) Students of, and teachers in, educational institutions in foreign countries who are brought to the United States individually or in groups under the provisions of this Act shall be selected through an agency of the government of the country in which they reside, or through the Institute of International Education or a comparable foreign organization. The tours in the United States of such foreign students and teachers and their participation and presentation in festivals, competitions, and like exhibitions in the United States shall be arranged for by the Institute of International Education or a comparable organization."

(b) Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) (as designated by subsection (a) of this section) of section 3 of such Act is amended (1) by inserting "professional or nonprofessional" immediately before "creative", and (2) by inserting immediately after "groups" the following: "(including individuals or groups from educational institutions)".

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 is amended (1) by inserting "(1)" immediately after "nations by", (2) by inserting "including cultural developments and achievements of students and teachers in educational institutions in the United States" immediately after "people of the United States", and (3) by striking out "throughout the world;" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "throughout the world, and (2) facilitating the presentation in the United States of the artistic

and cultural contributions and achievements of the peoples of foreign countries."

Sec. 3. Section 5 of the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Not less than 20 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be expended to carry out the provisions of section 3(c)."

Sec. 4. (a) Subsection (a) of section 10 of the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 is amended (1) by striking out "from among its membership and nine other members appointed by the Secretary of State." and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "from among its membership, and a Vice Chairman ex officio who shall be the Commissioner of the United States Office of Education, and twenty-one other members appointed by the Secretary of State."; and (2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "including national educational organizations in such fields".

(b) The twelve members of the Advisory Committee on the Arts first appointed to the offices created by the amendment made by clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be appointed by the Secretary of State from among persons nominated by such organizations as the Music Educators National Conference, the American Educational Theater Associations, the College Art Association of America, the National Art Education Association, the National Council of the Arts in Education, the American National Theater and Academy, the National Music Council, the American Federation of Arts, the American Institute of Architects, the National Education Association, the American Council on Education, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Association of American Colleges. The term of office of three of the members first appointed to such offices shall be one year, notwithstanding the provisions of section 10(d) of such Act.

Sec. 5. Title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended by inserting immediately after section 104 thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 104A. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959, and for each succeeding fiscal year, from the foreign currencies which accrue under this title, not to exceed the equivalent of \$5,000,000 for financing the translation, production, and distribution of educational motion pictures and filmstrips abroad."

[From the New York Times, Aug. 6, 1959]
EDUCATORS PLAN WORLD EXCHANGE—OFFER OF ASIAN AND EUROPEAN DELEGATES INVOLVES BOTH TEACHERS AND PUPILS

(By Leonard Buder)

WASHINGTON, AUGUST 5.—A spontaneous movement to promote closer relations between teachers of the East and West developed here today at the annual assembly of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession.

The move came when delegates from several European nations offered to set up programs to exchange information with Asian representatives. The exchange, first, proposed by the Netherlands teachers' organization, would involve pupils as well as teachers.

Dr. William G. Carr, secretary-general of the confederation, hailed the plan. Dr. Carr who is also executive secretary of the National Education Association of the United States, the host organization for the assembly, said that at first the program would be limited largely to an exchange of correspondence and educational materials.

However, he said that foundation grants might be obtained later to make it possible for teachers from eastern and western countries to visit each other.

The confederation's resolutions committee met today to draft its report. It is expected to present a resolution tomorrow calling for condemnation of their treatment of teachers. The assembly ends tomorrow.

A special report submitted earlier to the assembly asserted that East Germany forced its teachers to promote communism in and out of the classroom and to spy and inform on pupils and parents.

The only Communist country represented at the assembly is Yugoslavia.

About 700 delegates and observers from 74 countries are attending the assembly, which is the first in this country since the world organization was established in 1952. The confederation represents, through its member groups, more than 3 million teachers.

Sessions are being held at the Mayflower Hotel and the headquarters building of the National Education Association.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 4, 1959]

CHANGE OF DIRECTION ON VISITS: INVITATION TO KHRUSHCHEV IS CALLED EMOTIONALLY DIFFICULT FOR SOME IN UNITED STATES

(By Doris Fleson)

It was difficult to tell at his hastily summoned press conference whether President Eisenhower was relaxed and happy over his decision "to melt a little bit of the ice that seems to freeze our relations with the Soviets."

He spoke pleasantly enough, though showing a slight trace of irritation over the fact that so important a command decision should have been "one of the worst kept secrets of our time." This may have been only a reversion to his military days when such abundant leakage about so delicate a subject would have been unthinkable.

Certainly the President has had the green light from most political intersections for his exchange of visits with Soviet Premier Khrushchev. There can be little question that the people, not only of the United States but of the world, will go a long way in the name of peace. The new generations feel in their bloodstream the nuclear threat as older men and women cannot.

With the diplomatic instinct which served him so well during the war and can almost be said to have made him President, Mr. Eisenhower will see the major Western allies before the Soviet exchange. It was a commonplace at Geneva that General De Gaulle is happy about practically nothing touching upon the Soviet Union and that Chancellor Adenauer of West Germany is not far behind him.

Yet with all the Eisenhower support at home, and his sound intention of touching his bases before the face-to-face encounters with Khrushchev begin, the new project is one of those enterprises of great pith and moment whose currents may turn awry. The President has been a part of some great decisions that now can be defended only as a good idea at the time, such as allowing the Russians to reach Berlin first in World War II.

He also saw, and later became a part of, Republican use of the Yalta Conference failures in order to win elections at home. It is a wry irony, freely commented on in Congress after the President's announcement, that a Republican administration should now be heading toward conferences with the Soviet Premier, both here and in Russia, without even the excuse of a wartime alliance.

To make this possible, Stalin and Franklin Roosevelt had to die. Only Winston Churchill of the Yalta decision makers lives on, a stout champion of its validity in the

context of its time. It could even be that John Foster Dulles would have had difficulty in adjusting to the present pace of East-West relations.

The Republican right wing is already showing some sensitivity to cloakroom jokes about Vice President Nixon's "courtship of the Russians." This is the spot where the President's moves may be sourly regarded, but it is out of power in Congress and generally throughout the country.

Entirely apart from political considerations, there will also be Americans who find the change of direction emotionally difficult. Yet it seems clear that another watershed of history is here and demanding exactly the kind of direction the President proposes to give it.

The President emphasized that the Khrushchev exchange was for a "personal visit" and had no connection with a later summit meeting. He specifically disavowed negotiation and emphasized he could not speak for the Western Powers, only for the United States.

Yet in the light of the President's powers over foreign policy—the powers of which every President is most jealous—the Nixon journey is tourism and the Congress can do very little. And for his part, Khrushchev has repeatedly indicated that he would like to do a lot of business with the President of the United States.

The Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I share with millions of my fellow Americans a feeling of profound disturbance over the press acclaim which has been given to the decision by President Eisenhower to invite Nikita Khrushchev to this country and to pay him a return visit later this year. I am more than disturbed, but I do not wish to be intemperate in addressing the Congress and so I will not reveal the full depth of my feelings when I think of this disgraceful affair.

I will try to be objective and to list dispassionately my reasons for opposing the plan to welcome the Soviet dictator as an honored guest of an American President. I do not say the guest of the American people, because in my heart I am convinced that the majority of Americans will not welcome him and that they wish wholeheartedly that he had never been asked to come here.

First, Khrushchev in his own person and as the representative of Communist terrorism comes to us with bloodstained hands and all of his smiles, his buffoonery, and his peasant charm will never cleanse them. The blood of Hungarians, of Poles, of Ukrainians, of Tibetans, of Germans, of the Baltic peoples, of Koreans, of Chinese, and of countless others will not wash away. Every American who looks upon him while he is here should take a good look at those hands and in his mind's eye picture them newly stained with our blood and that of our children, which is the avowed aim of his regime and of Khrushchev himself. This is the man we are asked to greet as

a representative of a friendly people. Let any Russian peasant or Russian worker come and we would welcome them for they too have suffered, but let us not be asked to extend the hand of friendship to their tormentors. The blood will inevitably cling to us from such a handshake.

Second, this invitation and this visit are a sign of a craven yielding to blackmail and nothing more. When Khrushchev voiced his threats against the free people of Berlin and their American, French, and British protectors the citizens of this country did not quiver in fear. It appears, however, that in spite of the brave words voiced by our leaders at that time there was some quivering among them. How else can we explain this evidence of irresolution? It will certainly be as plain to Khrushchev as it is to me and to any thinking American that when our President asked him to come here it was not because he was welcomed as a friend, but that it was to treat with him as a blackmailer who threatened our security. How much success do you think you would have in persuading a man with a loaded gun at your head to come to an agreement on your terms? Common sense tells us that you must first disarm him or face him with an equally dangerous weapon before he will agree not to pull the trigger. This man is more dangerous than any common robber. Why have we invited him into our house instead of locking the doors against him until he is able to convince us that he has reformed?

Third, this invitation is an act of betrayal of the captive peoples of Europe and Asia. They will look on it as nothing less and I look on it as nothing less. As each of these nations has fallen under the domination of the conspiracy in the Kremlin, we have promised them that America would never desert them and that we would take every possible opportunity to help them regain their independence. Again, these were brave words but how much brave action has been taken in their support? I do not speak of military action, for none of us want to precipitate a war. But I do speak of morally strong, diplomatic, economic, and social action. I speak of imposing sanctions against every move which appears to perpetuate Communist domination over the once free peoples of Europe and over the Asiatic nations who have lost the opportunity given them by the Western World to chart their own futures. Instead of that kind of sanction our sweet talk to their Communist rulers can only be taken to mean that we are now sanctioning continued despotic rule over these peoples by their most bitter enemies.

Fourth, this unilateral action by our President and his advisers can only drive a further wedge between us and our Western allies and the democratic regimes which we support in other parts of the world. A face to face private talk between Khrushchev and the President, at the President's invitation, is something different from a multilateral conference in which our strongest friends have active participation. The press has made a great show of ex post facto approval

by the governments of these countries in support of this social get together. However, what lies behind the scenes? We know that with the possible exception of Great Britain there was no great enthusiasm in Europe even for a so-called Big Four summit meeting unless and until the Soviet Union had clearly demonstrated a willingness to recede from its aggressive stance. What happened at Geneva was just the opposite of this. Then how can we justify to the friendly nations of Europe, to their leaders and their citizens, this sudden about-face action on our part? Certainly it will create serious apprehension among them at the very least. I sincerely hope that the President on his coming visits to them will be able to allay their fears. More important, I hope that when he faces his unwelcome visitor in September he will not be taken in to the extent of agreeing on any action which will cause them further fear and lead to open distrust.

It is, of course, too late to retract this ill-timed gesture on the part of the President. I could wish that Mr. Khrushchev might be stricken with the same type of second thought which caused him to change his recent plan to visit the Scandinavian countries. However, this is too much to hope for in view of the great tactical victory he has achieved in being invited here. This being the case, I suggest that it is up to the American people to make clear to him just what our attitude to him and to his cohorts is, and just how strong is our determination to oppose his godless philosophy and his inhuman system at every turn. This is no time for egg throwing and insults, which show only an immature response to the great issues with which we are faced. The proper way to receive this man is in cold silence. I hope and pray that no great crowds will turn out to greet him with cheers and flag waving. I shudder at the thought that the streets of our Nation's Capital might be hung with the hammer and sickle as he is paraded before us. Let him see instead the Stars and Stripes of this great citadel of freedom. Let him see displayed at every hand the flags of the nations he and his kind have brought under the heel of the most despotic dictatorship in the history of mankind. Let him not see smiles of welcome but the stern faces of a people determined that freedom and democracy will triumph over brutality and oppression no matter what the cost.

Tribute to Jule Styne in Recognition of His 25 Years as Top Producer and Composer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Friars Club, along with leaders of show business, initiated a

commemoration of the Jule Styne 25th anniversary in show business—a year-long commemoration of this noted composer's multiple contributions to the world of entertainment. I am grateful for the opportunity to bring to the notice of my colleagues some of the great accomplishments of Jule Styne and invite them to join with me in paying tribute to a man whose contributions to the American cultural scene are most deserving of such an honor.

Jule Styne's name looms large and strong in the annals of show business. His current noteworthy musical contribution, "Gypsy," starring Ethel Merman in the musical-biography of Gypsy Rose Lee, auspiciously launches Jule Styne's 25th anniversary in show business.

The genius which is Jule Styne will live long in the hearts and minds of people everywhere, for his art has made impact in all branches of show business—motion pictures, television, radio, recordings, ballet and the stage. He has achieved success as a producer as well.

The life story of the man who gave music to millions to sing and dance to is as dramatic and stirring as any of the shows he has produced or composed for. He was born in London, England, on December 31, 1905. His musical inclinations came to the fore at the age of 3, when, sitting with his parents in a music hall in London, he jumped to the stage from a box seat to join Sir Harry Lauder in singing "I Love a Lassie." As a child entertainer, he danced and sang at parties and small shows.

In 1913, Jule and his family came to America and settled in Chicago. He was 8 years old and rapidly becoming a fine classical pianist. Jule won a scholarship to the Chicago College of Music, where he won the Mozart Award. Later he appeared with many symphony orchestras as a child prodigy.

His interest in popular music was awakened when he found the kids in school clustered around a jazz pianist who played very badly, but who played what the kids liked. Jule went to a music store and bought some popular songs to learn. Not having the money to pay for them, he worked out a deal to play at the store on Saturdays to pay for the music. The store was owned by Jack Kapp, later to become one of the greats of the recording industry. Learning to play popular music was the turning point in his musical career.

He matriculated at Northwestern University, but soon had to drop out because of financial difficulties at home. Later taking a job making metal coat hangers, he almost lost a finger as a result of an accident on one of the machines. He could not play for a year, practically losing his musical technique. Turning to pop music, he formed an orchestra, a success shortly in Chicago, the orchestra then became in demand throughout the country. Such greats as Bix Beiderbeck and Benny Goodman played in his bands.

While in Florida with Arnold Johnson's band, he wrote his first song, a beautiful melody called "Sunday." That night, at the Hollywood Beach Hotel, where he was appearing, Al Jolson and

Irving Caesar called him over after hearing the song and encouraged him to pursue the songwriting career.

He came to New York and became a coach for singers and a writer of special material. Jule wrote for Sophie Tucker and many of the other vaudeville greats of the time. Soon he became musical director for Harry Richmond and made his first trip to Hollywood. There Darryl Zanuck hired him to coach at 20th Century-Fox Studios such stars as Tony Martin, Shirley Temple, Alice Faye, among others. After a year of this, he told Zanuck he wanted to be a song writer. Zanuck said "fine, but not here." He sent him to Republic Studios. Cy Feuer gave him a job there at a salary of \$150 a week—he had been making \$950 a week at 20th Century-Fox as a music coach. Determined to make it as a song writer, he teamed with Frank Loesser and soon he was on his way. Loesser and Jule went to Paramount where their first effort was the smash, "I Don't Want To Walk Without You Baby." When Frank Loesser went into the Army, Styne teamed up with Sammy Cahn, and in 9 years this great team wrote over 500 songs. Fifty of them were on the "Hit Parade," of which 20 songs achieved No. 1 status.

Jule Styne, looking to new fields to conquer, then turned to theater. His first show in 1947, "High Button Shoes," he did with Sammy Cahn. Later he teamed with Leo Robin to write "Gentlemen Prefer Blondes." In 1950, he wrote "Two on the Aisle," with Betty Comden and Adolph Green. Back in Hollywood soon after, Zanuck hired him to do the score for a Betty Grable picture, "Meet Me After the Show."

He came back to Broadway after this film chore and won the drama critics' award with his revival of "Pal Joey." Following this, Jule produced "Hazel Flagg," "Will Success Spoil Rock Hunter," and brought Sammy Davis, Jr., to Broadway in "Mr. Wonderful."

Starting in 1943, Styne, along with various lyricists, was responsible for most of the Sinatra hits.

With Sammy Cahn, he wrote the memorable song, "Three Coins in a Fountain," title song of the 20th-Century Fox picture, and which won for the noted team the coveted Academy Award "Oscar."

Styne has many hobbies, most of which he works at. He is an excellent cook and delights in preparing unusual meals. An "80" golfer, he does not get a chance to play as often as he would like to. He is a fine rider and someday plans to have a horse breeding farm here in the East. Jule's vocation is writing songs and his avocation is producing shows. He gets a great deal of satisfaction in helping young performers, composers and lyricists.

Jule Styne has two sons, Stanley, 28, who is employed as a publicist at Columbia pictures and Norton, 18, who is a student at Syracuse University.

This is the brief life story of Jule Styne, who, currently at the peak of his career, maintains the same enthusiastic attitude toward show business he had during his struggling years. Success has not dimmed his ardor nor his

talent. The world will have many more songs, music and shows from this man, truly one of the greats of all time in show business.

Over the past 25 years, this versatile and talented American—Jule Styne—has written hundreds of songs, many of them which will long remain a permanent part of the American culture. He has composed the musical scores for many great American musical shows which, too, have become a permanent part of Americana: "High Button Shoes," "Gentlemen Prefer Blondes," "Two on the Aisle," "Hazel Flagg," "Peter Pan," "Bells Are Ringing," "Say, Darling," "Gypsy."

He has written the musical scores for the following ballets: "Wallflower," "Side Show," "Cops and Robbers Ballet."

He has won many great honors for his accomplishments as a producer, including the Donaldson award and the New York critics' award for "Pal Joey." As a producer, Jule Styne gave to the American theatrical world the following noteworthy productions: "Say, Darling"; "First Impressions"; "Make a Wish"; "Pal Joey"; "In Any Language," coproduced with George Abbott; "Hazel Flagg"; "Will Success Spoil Rock Hunter?"; "Mr. Wonderful."

Among the many motion-picture scores Jule Styne composed are the following: "Anchors Aweigh," "Tonight and Every Night," "The Umpire's Daughter," "Two Guys From Texas," "It's a Great Feeling," "The Kid From Brooklyn," "It Happened in Brooklyn," "The West Point Story," "Two Tickets to Broadway," "Don't Fence Me In," "Macao," "Pink Tights," "My Sister Eileen," "Living It Up."

Jule Styne's songs, which have brought happiness and great entertainment to peoples everywhere, include the following: "I Don't Want To Walk Without You, Baby"; "I Said No"; "Come Out, Come Out, Wherever You Are"; "I've Heard That Song Before"; "There Goes That Song Again"; "Saturday Night Is the Loneliest Night"; "I'll Walk Alone"; "Poor Little Rhode Island," official State song; "Three Coins in the Fountain"; "Five Minutes More"; "Let It Snow, Let It Snow"; "What Makes the Sunset"; "I Begged Her"; "I Fall in Love Too Easily"; "The Charm of You"; "It's Been a Long, Long Time"; "Can't You Read Between the Lines"; "Every Day I Love You"; "Fiddle Dee Dee"; "It's a Great Feeling"; "Time After Time"; "I Believe You"; "You Love Me"; "Papa, Won't You Dance With Me"; "I Still Get Jealous"; "You're My Girl"; "Bye, Bye, Baby"; "Diamonds Are a Girl's Best Friend"; "The Closer You Are"; "The Worry Bird"; "That's the Tune"; "Baby, You'll Never Be Sorry"; "You Kill Me"; "Talk to Me Tomorrow"; "Ocean Breeze"; "Catch Our Act at the Met"; "There Never Was a Baby Like My Baby"; "Give a Little, Get a Little"; "Hold Me, Hold Me, Hold Me"; "Everlasting"; "So Far, So Good"; "If You Hadn't, but You Did"; "How Will He Know?"; "How Do You Speak to an Angel?"; "I Feel Like I'm Gonna Live Forever"; "Salome"; "Think How Many People Never Find Love"; "You're Gonna Dance With Me"; "Willie"; "Money

Burns a Hole in My Pocket"; "A Little More Heart"; "My Wild Imagination"; "Every Street's a Boulevard in Old New York"; "Everybody Loves To Take a Bow"; "Laura De Maupassant"; "Captain Hooks Waltz"; "Distant Melody"; "Never, Never Land"; "Wendy"; "Just in Time"; "The Party's Over."

Jule Styne has been termed a virtual "Christopher Columbus" of show business—inasmuch as he has been responsible for discovering new talent. It has been a project close to his heart to reach out and search for young artists and give them their opportunity to make good in their chosen profession of show business. Jule Styne's great interest in finding new stars of the future and giving talent and opportunity has contributed many present-day stars to the entertainment world. The list of people he has helped in this way include Doris Day, Nanette Fabray, Carol Channing, Sheree North, Jayne Mansfield, Sandra Church, among others.

The lives of Americans throughout our land as well as the lives of people throughout the corners of the world have been enriched by the artistry and genius of Jule Styne. As an American, he has bought great credit to his country—the United States of America.

It is, therefore, fitting and proper for his fellow Americans to pay tribute to Jule Styne on the occasion of his 25th anniversary in show business. His accomplishments have been great—the position he holds in the hearts and minds of his fellow Americans is just as great.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in the past several weeks I have received a great deal of mail from teachers in my district with respect to H.R. 22. I particularly welcome this correspondence at this time, when our great newspapers are devoting increasing space to the dangers of inflation, and when our people are becoming progressively more indignant at the wanton extravagance of the Federal Government.

H.R. 22 would add fuel to the raging fires of inflation by further destroying the value of the dollar under a smoke-screen of care and consideration for our schoolchildren and their teachers. I submit that, if the bureaucrats have any love at all for our youth and those who guide them scholastically, then they will take their greedy hands out of the Federal Treasury and make more tax money available to those who earn it. Our States and communities are finding it difficult to meet expenses for schools and all necessary services primarily because taxpayers are being victimized by a voracious bureaucracy that drains off so much income that there is little left for meeting local costs. Instead of propos-

ing new schemes to expand Federal agencies and offices, Congress should dedicate itself to reducing expenditures in every way possible in order that embezzlement through inflation will be discontinued and the economy will be returned to a sound fiscal basis.

I have pointed out that interest alone on the national debt amounts annually to more than the total revenue collected from 20 million taxpayers each contributing the sum of \$400. Congress can make its greatest contribution to the economic stability of this Nation by trimming expenses wherever possible and applying such savings to reducing the national debt and cutting taxes. A 10 percent reduction in the debt, with a subsequent savings on interest, would make more than \$800 million available each year to taxpayers for building schools, increasing salaries of teachers, and for whatever other uses the citizenry would choose to make of it.

H.R. 22 would have a directly opposite effect. Further inflation would boost interest rates and lessen the buying power of everyone's dollar—the parent, the teacher, the butcher and the baker. Retired teachers and other pensioners would find means of subsistence even more elusive, what with their monthly checks having less and less value.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to allow the Federal Government to exact tribute for another expensive activity that would add to our already excessive tax burdens. Furthermore, we cannot afford to allow the Federal Government to get a foot in the door of our local schools. Subsidization breeds control, and anyone familiar with bureaucratic ambitions and operations recognizes that the threat of Federal management of our educational system is inherent in H.R. 22. The Federal Government has already usurped too much power and responsibility. We must be alert to any attempt—regardless of how innocuous it may appear—to nationalize our public school system.

H.R. 22 is inimical to the national welfare. As for its treatment of individual States, Pennsylvania taxpayers resent the provision that would require us to contribute millions of dollars to the schools of Texas and other States currently enjoying a far greater degree of economic prosperity. H.R. 22 would take a total of \$313,824,000 from Pennsylvania in the specified 4-year period. In return Pennsylvania would receive \$267,450,000. However, the State of Texas would pay in \$186,292,000 and take out \$270,450,000. Is there any justification for this inequitable arrangement? With this great flow of revenue siphoned out of Pennsylvania in return for the lesser contribution of the Federal Government, our State and our communities would find less and less money available to carry out our responsibilities to our schools and teachers.

Mr. Speaker, the whole philosophy of this program is so irrational that it should never come to the floor of this legislative body. Our major domestic responsibility at this time is to reduce Government expenditures and return this country to a safe fiscal status. Under the guise of aid to education, H.R.

22 is nothing more than a raid on education. It should be rejected by everyone who values our schools and respects our teaching profession.

Why I'm for the Shelley Bill, a Labor Reform, Antiracketeering Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD T. FLYNN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, I speak out to call attention of the House to the fact that powerful lobbies, aided—I trust, unwittingly—by the President of the United States, are trying to stampede this body to legislate against the democratic rights of America's working men and women.

The "tough labor bill" under the guise of putting an end to abuse which all of us oppose, is a cynical attempt to take from union members some of the essential tools of democratic unions.

"Secondary boycott" has become an infamous phrase in the hysterical lobbying which inundates the Congress today; but what are the facts about secondary boycotts?

It is already illegal under the Taft-Hartley Act, section 8(b) (4) (A), for employees of one firm to strike or refuse to work to force their employer to stop doing business with some other employers.

But some employers and unions have signed agreements which, in effect, say that the employer will not insist that his employees work on goods which come from an employer who has a dispute with the union. Is this wrong?

Abuses of these "hot cargo" clauses have been one springboard from which the tough labor bill has been launched.

The tough bill pressure groups spew out scare words and cite examples of "extortion" or "blackmail picketing." But they do not stop at urging us to pass a law which outlaws these practices. The fact is the Shelley bill and the Elliott bill, as well as the Griffin-Landrum bill, specifically outlaw these practices and provide heavy criminal penalties for violators. The Landrum-Griffin bill, however, exploiting the deep concern of the American people about the abuses widely publicized by the McClellan committee, goes beyond the correction of abuses; it abridges basic rights of working people: The right to bargain freely, the right of a worker to refuse struck work, the right to peacefully picket a struck plant.

It seeks to limit legitimate collective bargaining agreements where no abuses have been cited.

In the needle trades industry, for example, union workers and employers commonly agree not to do business with sweatshop subcontractors. By outlawing such agreements, the Griffin-Landrum bill would deprive honest, clean democratic union people of this most proper and time-tested device to improve working conditions in that industry.

It forces strikebreaking by innocent workmen against their will.

The Supreme Court has said that employees of one firm may refuse to do work farmed out to them from a struck firm. Under the Landrum-Griffin bill, however, this right of workingmen is removed except in cases where the second employer has a contract to perform the work for the first employer and the refusal is limited to services which would ordinarily be performed by the striking employees. This requirement bores a loophole in our labor law big enough for every strikebreaking employer to completely evade the intent of this section of the Taft-Hartley Act. The Griffin-Landrum bill, in this particular, is clearly an instrument to coerce workers to help employers break strikes in situations in which even the Taft-Hartley law now protects them from this degrading servitude. It legalizes collusion between employers to break strikes while outlawing the most fundamental human act in the democratic labor movement—the refusal to join the boss in punishment of other workmen.

It outlaws fundamental picket action in a primary labor dispute. The most vicious effect of the Griffin-Landrum section 705 will result from its elimination of concerted conduct from the concept of the secondary boycott. Under Taft-Hartley, what is outlawed is inducing concerted action by employees not to perform work. Under Griffin-Landrum if a striking worker appeals to a single other worker not to cross the picket line, he violates the law. Gentlemen, no Member of Congress can at once be devoted to the American system of collective bargaining and subscribe to this strikebreaking language.

I should like to call your attention to the fact that the Senate, in its consideration of the bill, earlier this session rejected a provision substantially the same as the one here proposed by Griffin-Landrum.

Griffin-Landrum outlaws union's free speech educational picketing.

On the ground that retailers of products from a struck firm were being restrained, a union could—under Landrum-Griffin—be deprived of its right to urge the public through newspaper ads, radio, and the mails, not to buy from a struck firm. Here again the remedy goes far beyond the correction of coercive practices and indeed goes so far as to take rights away from workers to the detriment of the institution of American industrial relations.

I believe that every friend of labor in this House, and there are many of us, who will take the time to look behind the scare words and the extreme example of the tough bill proponents—and read the bill—will recognize that this section deprives workers of rights. It does not protect them or the public from racketeering or collusion. It was not written here to punish crooks, but to hobble labor.

Landrum-Griffin will encourage collusion between corrupt management and union leaders.

Mr. Speaker, as I read section 705 of the so-called tough labor bill, I am appalled to find that the authors of the bill

have become so reckless in their "get labor" binge that they have written an unmistakable invitation to the racketeer and the unscrupulous employer to join together to prevent honest unions from organizing.

Organizational picketing is prevented where the employer has lawfully recognized another labor organization or where a valid election has been held during the past year. What this means is that either by agreement or the device of a quickie election, the employer can influence the choice of a union for his employees, then for a 12-month period a legitimate union cannot legally picket to begin its organizing campaign even though it was not involved in the previous election. At the end of the 12-month period, without one day's time given to the intervening union to organize with this traditional technique, the employer and his union can be almost certain of continuing this relationship.

I say to the tough bill proponents on this one, your motives are showing. You are cooperating with management and labor crooks, you are outlawing the honest organizer and giving the green light to the most corrupt agent exposed by the McClellan committee—the union boss who will sell out the workers to sign a dues collecting contract with the boss.

Mr. Speaker, there are other ways in which the Griffin-Landrum bill exceeds the just demand of the American people for labor reform. I am not going to describe all of them, but any one of these punitive sections I have described should be enough to turn this Congress away from this measure. This bill—to the extent it goes beyond the Shelley bill—will not protect workers or their unions; it will steal from them their legitimate tools of organizational bargaining.

Unfortunately, moderates and liberals in the House, recognizing on one hand the clamor of the American public for labor reform and, on the other hand, the readymade position of labor's enemies to easily exploit this sentiment, have seen fit to bring out a bill which, although it is not nearly as punitive as the Landrum-Griffin bill, nevertheless, makes concessions to the enemies of labor in an attempt to appease and accommodate and, let us be honest, to legislate. I do not impugn the motives of the sponsors of the Elliott bill. I believe they are friends of labor who believe some sacrifice of honest labor's interests must be made as a price for sufficient support for passage of labor reform legislation in this session of Congress.

Tactically, these good colleagues may be right. I hope they are wrong. But, on principle, they cannot be right. It is a dishonor to the House to pass legislation nominally written to protect labor but which, in fact, is in part written to punish labor as a price for its support.

The Elliott bill is inequitably easy on employer reporting; it foolishly invites misuse of union membership lists and effects no democratic reform or other advantage for the list giveaway; it restricts organizational picketing and "hot cargo" clauses, although not nearly as dangerously as does Landrum-Griffin, still unnecessarily. Without principled correction of the weaknesses or assurances

that these failures can be taken care of in conference, the House should not support this bill.

The Shelley bill does not go to excess. It does the job of labor reform and does not do a job on labor.

I implore the House: Do not let the anti-labor lobby din make you misread your mail. The American people want labor reform—there can be no argument about that. But the American people want strong unions—able to do the job workers built them to do. The American people are not hysterical on this issue. They write us to tell us to "get tough with the crooks"; and I agree we should do this. But they expect us to keep a level head, to make the law meet the abuses, to legislate for corrective action, not punitive action against the innocent democratic labor movement which these same American people embrace.

The need is for anti-racketeering legislation. The Shelley bill is 69 pages of just that. Most provisions are the same as those proposed by the Senate committee and by last year's Kennedy-Ervin bill. It is an honest, unemotional bill, tough on crooks but respectful of the democratic American free labor movement, the same labor movement which has made such a significant contribution to the greatness of America and has, moreover, led the Congress in waging war against Communists, corruption, and racketeers by cleaning its own ranks by exposures and expulsions.

"Red" Blaik, Army's Illustrious Former Coach, Brings a New Freshness to Football Reporting and Recognizes Validity of Brains and Leadership in the Game by Establishing a Worthwhile Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that those of us who had admired the contribution of "Red" Blaik to modern football as coach of Army's "Black Knights of the Hudson" learned of his resignation early this year.

It is now with much pleasure that we learn that "Red" Blaik's talents have not been lost entirely to the world of football.

I am directing the attention of the House to the announcement that Colonel Blaik has consented to write on the subject closest to his heart—football.

With the permission of the House I am including in these remarks the first article written by Colonel Blaik for the Associated Press which tells the full story.

I have no apologies to make for my position that our service academies, Army, Navy, and Air Force, should be represented on the gridiron and in other fields of sports with the strongest talent

available. I have done everything I could to assist each Academy in this endeavor and I will continue to lend my cooperation because no American should be satisfied with anything less than the best for our service academies.

I have long advocated participation of the service academies in bowl games and feel some satisfaction in the small part which I have been privileged to play in bringing about participation in such bowl games. Such participation has stimulated interest of the Nation's youth in our military service and the consequent benefits resulting to the Navy and Air Force has been beyond accurate measurement.

It is to be regretted that the Army has failed to take advantage of the chance to participate in any bowl game although the opportunity has been theirs. I sincerely hope that this shortsighted policy will soon be adjusted. Refusal of the Army to participate in a bowl game has even been in defiance of a policy adopted by its own board of visitors in 1954 and also contrary to the desires of its own coaches and players.

I am further concerned over reports coming to me that the Army is going to further limit its football program, placing it on an Ivy League status. This would indeed be a tragedy. "Red" Blaik brought the Army's teams to hitherto unscaled heights and thrilled a grateful American public with brilliant teams befitting the U.S. Military Academy. Now to tear down what Blaik has built after he has departed would be inconceivable. The American people deserve better treatment from the U.S. military authorities. The leadership developed on the football is not only reflected by the Army but by all schools participating in the game.

As Members of Congress we should do everything to preserve the great athletic tradition of the service academies and accept no less on the athletic field than we have come to expect in the field of education. The two go hand in hand. We should alert ourselves against any change in policy which would make West Point second and inferior to other like institutions in the Nation.

When the Navy participated in the Sugar Bowl and later in the Cotton Bowl it brought honor and glory to all hands in the Navy.

When the Air Force Academy defied the prophets and fought its way into the Cotton Bowl last year it captured the hearts and imagination of the American people and added prestige to the youngest of our services.

All this and more was denied the Army because it turned deaf ears to bowl invitations.

Today the Army, of the three services, is fighting for its life and its existence in the field of survival among the services.

Unless the Army's attitude in the athletic arena is changed it will find itself standing on the side of the road looking at the procession, led by the Navy and Air Force, go by.

But back to "Red" Blaik and his future activity in the football world. Read this opening article and statement of policy and intent and I am sure you will

find in it the freshness to which I have referred and an excellent contribution to a better understanding and fuller recognition of the fact that football players are intelligent and students as well as athletes:

BLAİK HOPES TO HELP FOOTBALL BY WRITING
(By Col. Earl H. (Red) Blaik, former Army football coach)

When I retired from coaching last January 13, after 25 years—18 at West Point and 7 at Dartmouth—I said it was unthinkable to overstay a career. But it would be just as inconceivable for me to sever completely my connections with the greatest of American games, which has been inseparable from most of my 61 years. That is why I was pleased and challenged when the Associated Press invited me to write two articles a week for the newspapers of the country.

While one is coaching, he is necessarily preoccupied with the football problems of one school. Although he is aware that the college game, like any human operation of which the dollar sign is part, is not without its weaknesses and requires continuing reevaluation and modification. The individual coach is in a position to contribute relatively little, much as he would like to do more.

In this invitation, I see an opportunity to try to help college football, not in any one school or area or within one peripherized philosophy, but in a broad, objective manner to help all colleges everywhere. College football today, while not without some abuses, has reached a plateau of excellence in its general conduct, unmatched in any era of the past. This emphatically bespeaks the love of and concern for the game by all its levels of administrators everywhere, and they deserve, therefore, every measure of encouragement and help. I hope to contribute in this way.

WON'T DUCK CONTROVERSY

My articles will very frequently be of a controversial and critical nature. But I assure you the controversy will be real, not fabricated, and that the criticism will always be constructive. It never will be directed at an individual but at something I feel stands correction and improvement. I repeat, I am concerned with what is good for all the colleges, remembering that what is good and practical in one area is not always so in another.

The articles I am preparing to appear between now and Friday, September 18, the eve of the first major Saturday of play, will appraise the strength of teams and players in various sections, but they also will treat of changes of trends, good and bad, affecting the game both on and off the field. Each Friday, beginning September 18, I will analyze where I believe the strength lies in the big game of the next day, yet more often than not I plan to include in the analysis a controversial or behind-the-scenes factor that has a relation to it.

Once the season is under way on Saturday, September 19, the articles appearing in the Tuesday papers will deal with colorful and dramatic highlights, backgrounds and, again, trends and controversies developing on the college scene, either nationally or from a sectional point of view that has some impact nationally.

Whatever financial remuneration I receive for these articles will be used to help college football. I am establishing eight fellowships for postgraduate work. They will be awarded to those eight boys, one from each of the National Collegiate Athletic Association districts, who have been adjudged as best meeting the following four qualifications:

They must be seniors. They must be leaders in academics as well as football. They must exert a fine influence on their

campuses. They must be staunch in their devotion to the welfare of amateur sports.

The fellowships will be administered by the National Football Foundations Awards Committee, headed by Vincent Draddy. The foundation committee will be assisted by an awards committee from each of the eight NCAA districts, each nominating a candidate from its district.

These fellowships should help project what I believe to be a fact about college football, yet one seldom emphasized: That championship performance and superior scholarship are entirely compatible.

Little City, Dream Community for the Mentally Retarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me extreme pleasure today to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech recently made by my colleague, the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, at the dedication ceremonies of Little City, a dream community for mentally retarded youngsters, which is being built on the outskirts of Chicago's great Northwest Side.

I should like to associate myself with the penetrating remarks of Congressman ROOSEVELT and congratulate those wonderful people of Little City, Inc., who have undertaken this great project of mercy for the mentally retarded children of America. To these fine sponsors of this project go the heartfelt thanks of parents throughout this country who so frequently recognize the problems of a retarded youngster but tragically are unable to find adequate facilities for relief.

I am proud that Little City lies practically in the shadow of my district, and I am sure that in due time, from its humble beginning will rise an institution of mercy for the mentally retarded youngsters of America who need help so urgently.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman ROOSEVELT's remarks follow:

LITTLE CITY, DREAM COMMUNITY FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED

Ladies and gentlemen, Little City is a magic word for all of us here today. For some it represents weeks and months and years of planning and hard work. For many this community is a single avenue of hope in an otherwise gloomy landscape. For still others like myself, Little City represents a monumental achievement, a soul-lifting experiment.

Today we humbly dedicate this new community. I stress the word community for this is not merely a home, a hospital, a school, or a center, but a little city for mentally retarded children. This city will not limit its assistance to the 50 or 60 children who will enter this fall. Plans have already been made to expand the facilities to care for 500 children. The opportunities for research in this environment will extend the benefits of this community to countless numbers of mentally retarded children and their families in this and other countries.

These 60 acres of land on Algonquin Road will be a paradise for mentally retarded youngsters. Here they will be able to develop to the fullest extent their abilities in a sheltered and peaceful atmosphere. This community as part of the larger community will be a testimony to the shared responsibility of individuals in our society for this problem. Three out of every one hundred children in this country are born retarded, and the parents of these children will know that they now have the assistance and support of others. They have already accomplished so much through their own volunteer organizations, and I think it is high time that such a project be undertaken by the whole community.

I was very much interested in learning about a study conducted by the Public Institutions Committee of the National Association for Retarded Children. May I quote a passage from the foreword of this 1958 study. It states:

"It is bitter irony to tax parents for the unavoidable misfortune of having a retarded child. We must wonder if it is consistent with American social philosophy to require that parents of mentally retarded children pay taxes to support public education facilities which exclude their children, when there is a price tag on their attempts to obtain equal benefits for their children in public institutions."

This study revealed that only 3 States make no financial charge for the care, training and treatment of persons in State institutions; that 2 States allow for voluntary charges; and that the other 42 States having such institutions levy charges. The study further showed that most parents of handicapped children expect to assume financial responsibility for the basic support of their child. However, they need assistance in meeting some of the extraordinary demands created by the handicapped condition. Often the financial strain of meeting costs of needed services before placement in a State institution leaves the family resources well drained. Many feel that the care and training of a person in an institution should be regarded in lieu of public school education.

These facts are not new to those of you here today. I am sure you have struggled with these realities and attempted to put across your points of view to public and private groups. May I say that I am encouraged each year to find that the public awareness of these problems is constantly increasing. The very achievement of this dream community is an indication of greater understanding by the community as a whole of the needs of the mentally retarded.

One of the most inspiring aspects of Little City from my point of view is that here at last the total needs of the mentally retarded will be met. So many of the existing programs are what we have been accustomed to term "half a loaf" programs. That is they go part of the way in meeting a special problem, but then they stop. For instance, a family may be able to provide their mentally retarded child with a little education. But this is not enough if proper medical care and vocational guidance cannot be obtained. To turn to another example, much excellent research is currently being carried on in mental retardation. If this research is conducted in an ivory tower or does not reach the people who can use it, the efforts will have been largely wasted.

In Little City these problems will not be present. Here mentally retarded people of all races and creeds will have a home as long as they need or desire it. There will be no fear of expulsion upon reaching a certain chronological age which may bear no relation to individual development.

Every individual will learn at his own rate, will set his own pattern, will live in a community where his behavior is the norm. No

longer the outsider, he will participate as a member of his own little city. Fields, orchards, and gardens for some to cultivate; schools for those who can benefit or a home tutoring service when this is more profitable; community church, movies, square dancing, playground—all these will make up a rich and full life for these youngsters.

Of course, these plans require financial support, and many of you have already been asked to contribute or have solicited others for funds. It is my belief that this is one project which sells itself. The ingenuity and intelligent planning of such persons as Mrs. Della White, Ben Sears, and the many others who have so carefully thought through every detail of this program, will be rewarded, I feel certain, by the wholehearted support of the entire community.

Your Federal Government has also shown its special concern for the mentally retarded in a number of ways. Today I would like to discuss with you some of these programs. It seems to me that constant awareness and recognition of these activities are essential to their continued successful operation. Only through the enlightened experience of citizens and parents such as you who are present will we be able to judge whether the programs on a national scale are meeting the real needs of the mentally retarded, are being efficiently administered, and are generally available to those who need them.

The very existence of governmental programs to aid the mentally retarded is open acknowledgment by the national community of their responsibilities in this area. These programs are prompted by the same kind of civic spirit which has moved you to build Little City. There are nearly 5 million mentally retarded individuals in this country and they cannot and must not be ignored. To use the words of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in describing its various programs:

"From a number of standpoints progress is being made in the field of the mentally retarded as outgrowths of an increased public awareness and understanding of the problems both in Government and in private life with individuals and voluntary organizations and the increasing advances being achieved in medicine, welfare, education, rehabilitation and related fields. The cross-fertilization and collaboration of many disciplines are also bringing to pass the more effective knowledge concerning the prevention of the handicaps together with improved understanding, treatment, care, and prognosis of those who manifest the several difficulties in the functional sphere."

Responsibility for the Government programs aiding retarded individuals is lodged in the several agencies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. You here in Little City are blessed with the opportunity of meeting nearly all the demands of the children who will come under your care. Unfortunately the Department can in no way approach this goal for all the mentally retarded children throughout the country. They have attempted to utilize their existing programs in the best possible way to assist these handicapped children. Legislation over the years has continued to increase the responsibilities of the Department in various areas.

The Department is most conscious of the need to have a balanced approach to mental retardation. They have formed a departmental committee composed of representatives from various operating agencies to cooperate in and coordinate their programs.

I, and a large number of my colleagues, have found these governmental programs most encouraging and we have continual reports of their fine accomplishments. Many of you have had direct contact with some of these programs and for you I hope that what I have to say will not be too repetitious.

It is my hope that a description of the national impact of these programs may be of interest and that perhaps there will be some aspect of these activities with which you are not familiar and about which you would like to be informed.

The Federal Government has been especially active in five areas: education, vocational rehabilitation, medical research, Children's Bureau assistance to the States, and direct benefits under social security. These programs correspond to certain of the needs of the mentally retarded. Needless to say, it is difficult to categorize them, and it is perhaps more meaningful to talk about some examples of their activities.

The Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has performed a vital task in preparing, collecting, and distributing information on all exceptional children as well as mentally retarded and has prepared exceedingly valuable reports on curriculum and classroom methods as well as numerous other aspects of education of the mentally retarded. This is an attempt to aid the State and local school programs by making available to all the very latest developments in this rapidly growing field.

The second major responsibility of this department and one which is important in all phases of work with the mentally retarded is the securing of qualified personnel. No amount of knowledge on modern teaching methods, no increase in the number of facilities will compensate for the lack of qualified personnel. The closing days of the 85th Congress were exciting days for those interested in this problem, for with the passage of Public Law 85-926 came the authorization for a program to train personnel to teach the mentally retarded. One million dollars for this program was included in the President's budget for fiscal 1960 and this sum has been appropriated by Congress. The Office of Education has been actively engaged in preparing to administer this project and three conferences with interested parties have already been held. This program will go a long way in narrowing the glaring inadequacies in the provision of education for mentally retarded children in this country.

In another area, that of vocational rehabilitation, mentally retarded individuals have been eligible for Government services since 1943. It is estimated that in the next 2 years alone, over 2,600 persons will be rehabilitated into gainful employment. This is a difficult task but the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is constantly striving to meet the challenge of rehabilitating the mentally handicapped. Cooperative programs with State vocational rehabilitation agencies and public school systems have been important. In two States "halfway houses" or "rehabilitation houses" have combined rehabilitation with living arrangements. Of course the mentally retarded children who come to Little City will have all this and a lot more. Perhaps some of the results of your experience will be an inspiration to the Federal programs.

In the field of rehabilitation too, there has been a shortage of qualified personnel. To meet this problem, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is granting funds to educational institutions all over the country for the training of personnel in this field.

Among the most encouraging activities in this field are those being carried on in Bethesda, Md., at two of the National Institutes of Health—the Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness and the Mental Health Institute. Here research scientists are struggling with the perplexing problem of what causes mental retardation. I feel certain that all of you in the audience today await a more complete answer to this question with bated breath.

Surgeon General Burney has recently announced a 5-year survey of 40,000 women to

find the causes of mental retardation and kindred defects. Already investigators in Puerto Rico have recorded brain damages in monkeys cut off from a supply of oxygen at birth. This has prompted intensive study of the relationship between asphyxia and mental retardation. Scientists are also studying the effects of encephalitis and German measles in the causation of mental retardation. Geneticists are studying family records to determine the influence of congenital malformations.

The National Institute of Mental Health is conducting a valuable research program through the awarding of research grants to qualified applicants. Approximately 50 different projects are now being supported. The Institute is also a central point for the collection of data on patients in resident institutions for the mentally retarded throughout the country. This information has been tremendously useful, and, as a matter of fact, formed the foundation of the study of the National Association of Retarded Children which I mentioned earlier. The Institute also carries on training programs and provides assistance to the States and communities through its Community Services Branch.

The Children's Bureau also aims to help the States and communities. Activities include public information, consultation, and the provision of grant-in-aid programs to encourage the extension of existing State and local service. Demonstration projects have been especially useful in showing the kinds of services needed for the preschool child. These have included casefinding, evaluation and diagnosis, followup care and home training.

Finally, I turn to a Federal program which has filled a desperate need for financial assistance for so many families. This is the protection available under social security for the mentally retarded. According to the provisions of various States, the mentally retarded receive assistance under the program of aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the public assistance program. Coverage under old-age and survivors and disability insurance is also an important source of assistance. The 1956 and the 1958 amendments to the Social Security Act broadened coverage to make childhood disability benefits available for seriously disabled persons whose disability began before age 18 and has continued without interruption since that time, and whose parents died insured or are receiving retirement benefits. Mentally retarded persons are heavily represented among those who qualify for these benefits. The importance of making the public aware of these provisions cannot, of course, be overestimated.

So at the national level, as in Little City itself, a variety of professional disciplines and resources are being used to meet the tremendously complex problem of mental retardation. For much of this century retardation was a wholly neglected field. Mental retardation was assumed to be a single disease entity largely determined by heredity and unresponsive to treatment. Today we know these precepts to be false. At last we are building up our community services, our institutions, our educational facilities. Little City is a bright star in this development. You are in the vanguard of progress, and let us hope that you will soon be followed by many others.

You have understood the message of Mrs. Pearl Hurwitz, a leader in the field of mental retardation, who, writing in the *Radcliffe College Quarterly* for February 1957, attempted to explain the great upsurge of popular interest in mental retardation. She said: "It is because the world is very much with us today. We know (many of us subconsciously) that if our way of life is to survive, every individual, be he handicapped or whole, be he white or black, be he a privileged American or an underprivileged peas-

ant in India, every individual must be counted an individual and accorded his place in the sun.

"For every person who is discounted, by so much do we allow for the spread of discontent; for every person whom we help to

attain his life stature, by so much do we prevent the spread of strife.

"We are becoming aware that preventive hygiene must expand beyond total inoculation from communicable disease to total service for every disabling condition, or we

are liable to be afflicted by the consequence. The social loss or the social gain is shared by all."

Today we dedicate Little City, a living example of the shared responsibility of many for the needs of the mentally retarded.

SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 11, 1959

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, safely to another week with its toiling days Thou hast brought us on our way. May the way we take be Thy way for our feet in these tense times. We need Thy presence every passing hour.

In spite of rude and bitter winds of opposition to our designs for world betterment, in this land of the free may we keep the torch of hope blazing for the distressed and disinherited across all the frontiers of want and woe.

Save the Republic we love, and whose servants we are, from policies without principle, from pleasures without moral or spiritual control, from labor uninspired by a sense of honor, from a level of life in which the servants of the soul become its masters.

In this garish day so rich in things and poor in soul deliver us from the tyranny of the tangible. May the sacred temple of our inner lives harbor nothing unworthy of our high calling in Thee.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 7, 1959, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 7, 1959, the following report of a committee was submitted:

Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, on August 10, 1959, reported favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 1711) to promote the foreign policy of the United States and help to build essential world conditions of peace, by the more effective use of U.S. agricultural commodities for the relief of human hunger, and for promoting economic and social development in less-developed countries, and submitted a report (No. 632) thereon.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On August 7, 1959:

S. 1928. An act to provide for the participation of the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank.

On August 11, 1959:

S. 906. An act to amend section 1622 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to clarify the meaning of the term "change of program of education or training" as used in such section;

S. 1110. An act to amend the act of August 4, 1955 (Public Law 237, 84th Cong.), to provide for conveyance of certain interests in the lands covered by such act;

S. 1694. An act to extend the existing authority to provide hospital and medical care for veterans who are U.S. citizens temporarily residing abroad to include those with peacetime service-incurred disabilities;

S. 2153. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to accept, operate, and maintain a certain defense housing facility at Yorktown, Va., and for other purposes; and

S. 2183. An act granting the consent of Congress to interstate compacts for the development or operation of airport facilities.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1371) to repeal the act approved March 3, 1897, and to amend the act approved December 20, 1944, relating to fees for transcripts of certain records in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 746) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes," approved April 22, 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 137. An act to allow a deduction, for Federal estate tax purposes, in the case of certain transfers to charities which are subjected to foreign death taxes; and

H.R. 451. An act to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, with respect to the payment of compensation in cases where third persons are liable.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7508) to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a Bureau of Naval Weapons in the Department of the Navy and to abolish the Bureaus of Aeronautics and Ordnance.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amend-

ments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 213) to provide additional time within which certain State agreements under section 218 of the Social Security Act may be modified to secure coverage for nonprofessional school district employees; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. FORAND, Mr. KING of California, Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MASON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7629) to make permanent the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans under section 17 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. POAGE, Mr. GRANT, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. DAGUE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45 to the bill (H.R. 7453) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. NORRELL, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HORAN, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 6585. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended;

H.R. 8225. An act to amend the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act of the District of Columbia, as amended, to permit paregoric to be dispensed by oral as well as written prescription;

H.R. 8392. An act to amend the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 with respect to motor-vehicle parking areas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8527. An act to exempt certain pension and other employee trusts from the laws of the District of Columbia relating to perpetuities, restraints on alienation, and accumulation of income; and

H.R. 8575. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1289. An act to increase and extend the special milk program for children;